

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has indicated that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The Applicant has amended the title in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and to be more descriptive of the claimed invention.
2. The Examiner has rejected claims 7-10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Irons (U.S. Patent No. 6, 192, 165). As the Applicant has cancelled claims 7-10 and 12-13 without prejudice, the Examiner's rejection thereof is thus rendered moot.
3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons. The Applicant has amended claim 11 to be in independent form and to recite and include the limitations of independent claim 8 from which it previously depended. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1 and 11 because the Applicant respectfully submits that Irons fails to teach or suggest that the data contained within the user interface tag includes information indicating and subsequently causing a service to be performed. It is the Applicant's understanding that the Examiner has taken the position that Iron's teaching "that the machine readable portion of a label may contain additional information, such as information on document disposition" suggests "a performed service, and providing the advantage of disposition associated with the invoices of Irons Figures 8,9". The Applicant respectfully submits that in Irons the service being performed is the indexing and filing of scanned documents themselves. The Applicant respectfully submits that in Irons, merely having other information for the document to be filed provides no suggestion or motivation to provide information regarding another

service to be performed on the document. While there may have been some operation performed on a version of a document relevant to a document being stored, there is no suggestion that such additional information causes the operation to be performed.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 11 fail to be rendered obvious by Irons and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw their 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 11.

The Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 4 and 5-6 depend on and incorporate the limitations of independent claim 1, which is distinguishable over Irons as described above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw their 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of dependent claims 4 and 5-6.

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 1 and further in view of the publication "Xerox tours DataGlyphs for paper data". The Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-3 depend on and incorporate the limitations of independent claim 1, which is distinguishable over Irons as described above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw their 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of dependent claims 2-3.

5. The Applicant has added independent claims 14-15. The Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 14-15 add no new matter as they incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claims 12-13 and the limitation of providing information on a service to be performed as found in independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing amendments and arguments overcome the Examiner's various 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and the Applicant respectfully respects that the Examiner grant allowance of all remaining pending and new claims.

In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Richard B. Domingo at 650-812-4269.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard B. Domingo
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36, 784
Telephone: 650-812-4269

Palo Alto, California
Date: 04/19/2002

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE:

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

In the Title:

USER INTERFACE IDENTIFICATION AND SERVICE TAGS FOR A
DOCUMENT PROCESSING SYSTEM

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 7-10 and 12-13 are cancelled without prejudice.

11. (Amended) A user interface tag bearing a machine-readable printed data code,
wherein the tag is adapted to be associated with a hardcopy document for scanning by
a document processing system, and wherein the data code comprises an identity code
representative of a user's identity ~~The tag of claim 8, wherein the data code further~~
~~comprises~~ and a service code specifying a service to be performed on said hardcopy
document.

Claims 14 and 15 are new claims.